

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Andrew Resh,)	Civil Action # 4:08-CV-00501-TLW-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	
)	
Ameristep, Inc. and Primal Vantage Company, Inc.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	
)	

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. #62). On August 18, 2010, the Magistrate Judge issued the Report. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that plaintiff counsel’s Motion to Reopen for Clarification and Settlement be denied, and that the dismissal of this case be deemed to be with prejudice. (Doc. #62). No party filed objections to the Report. Objections were due on September 7, 2010.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**.

(Doc. #62). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, plaintiff counsel's Motion to Reopen for Clarification and Settlement is hereby **DENIED**. (Doc. #47). The dismissal in this case is hereby deemed to be with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

September 10, 2010
Florence, South Carolina